

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

			* ***		
٦	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
	10/806,834	03/22/2004	Dong-Yeon Kim	ong-Yeon Kim 59300-CIP (71970)	
	21874 7590 02/03/2006			EXAMINER	
		& ANGELL, LLP		PRYOR, ALTON NATHANIEL	
	P.O. BOX 55874 BOSTON, MA 02205			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,			1616	,
				DATE MAILED: 02/03/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)						
	10/806,834	KIM ET AL.						
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Alton N. Pryor	1616						
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address						
Period for Reply								
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status								
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 November 2005</u> .  This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of Claims								
4) Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-8 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-8 is/are rejected.  7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.  Application Papers								
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.								
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>								
Attachment(s)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO.413)						
Notice of References Cited (P10-692)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/3/04.	Paper No(s)/Mail Da							

Application/Control Number: 10/806,834 Page 2

**Art Unit: 1616** 

## **DETAILED ACTION**

I. Rejection of claims 1,6-8 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Netzer et al will not be maintained. Applicant is correct in that Netzer discloses the instant compound wherein the piperazine has a hydroxyl attached rather than an alkyl as disclosed by the instant claims.

Applicant's arguments, see paper, filed 11/7/05, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1,6-8 under under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Netzer et al have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection and objection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of rejections below.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-4,6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. See MPEP § 2173.05(c). Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then

Art Unit: 1616

narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 1 recites the broad recitation 5 to 7 saturated monocyclic radical which has 1 to 3 hetero atoms selected from nitrogen, oxygen, and sulfur, and the claim also recites a piperazinyl or homopiperazinyl each of which is substituted by lower alkyl which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1,2,6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zimmermann et al (WO 99/03854; 1/18/099). Zimmermann teaches the compound (I), 4-(4-methylpiperain-1-ylmethyl)-N- [4-methyl-3-(4-pyridin-3-yl)pyrimidin-2-ylaminophenyl]benzamide. See abstract. Zimmermann teaches a pharmaceutical composition comprising the compound formula I. Zimmermann teaches that the composition can be administered orally to cancer patients. Zimmermann teaches the instant compound wherein R1 = 3-pyridyl; R7 = radical of formula (2); n = 0;

Application/Control Number: 10/806,834

Art Unit: 1616

R2,R3,R5,R6 = H; and R9 = 4-piperazinyl. Instant dependent claim 8 discloses a composition to be used as an injection. Note in a claim to a composition a statement with respect to the composition's intended use has no patentable significance.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Zimmermann as applied claims 1,2,6-8 above. Zimmermann teaches all that is recited
in claim 3 except for the compound having R4 = H. It would have been obvious to one
having ordinary skill in the art to have made the instant compound wherein R4 = H. One
would have been motivated to do this since H and methyl have been shown to be
chemically equivalent, and therefore, yield similar activity.

### Telephonic Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alton N. Pryor whose telephone number is 571-272-0621. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/806,834

Art Unit: 1616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Page 5

Alton Pryor

**Primary Examiner** 

AU 1616